

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-13 are pending in the present application. Claims 7 and 10 have been previously cancelled and claim 13 has been previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 3, 6 and 10 have been amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found at least in FIGS. 3 and 6, as well as on page 9, lines 24-25 of the specification, as originally filed. Claims 3, 6 and 10 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-12 are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 stands objected to for informalities. The Examiner states that claim 11 depends on cancelled claim 10.

Claim 11 has been amended to depend from claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claim 11 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 9, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Nagata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,624,857 B1, hereinafter "Nagata"). The Examiner states that Nagata discloses all of the elements of claims 1 and 2, primarily in FIG. 4 and column 8 lines 15-21. The Examiner also states that all of the elements of claim 9 are disclosed primarily in the last paragraph of column 25. The Examiner further states that all of the elements of claims 11 and 12 are disclosed in Nagata, primarily in the description of embodiments 1 and 2.

FIG. 4 of Nagata relied upon by the Examiner discloses a test pad 39A located closer to a bottom edge of the TFT array panel than driver 20a. However, and Nagata does not teach or suggest the test pad is disposed directly between the driver and the one edge of the TFT array, as in amended independent claim 1.

Furthermore, FIG. 4 of Nagata relied upon by the Examiner discloses inspection lines 21a, 21b and inspection lines 22a, 22b on opposite sides of the TFT array panel opposing corresponding drivers 20a and 20b, respectively.

Nagata does not teach or suggest an inspection line formed on the TFT array panel and under the driver for transmitting a test signal to the second display signal lines, as in amended independent claim 1.

Therefore, amended claim 1, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-6, 8, 9 and 11-12, define over Nagata.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 1, 2, 9, 11 and 12 under § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Nagata in view of Kawasaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,400 B1, hereinafter "Kawasaki"). The Examiner states that Nagata discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *a plurality of straight connecting lines interconnecting chip drivers wherein the test pad is closer to an edge of the liquid crystal panel than to the connecting lines and a plurality of flexible printed circuit films attached to the liquid crystal panel, wherein the external devices are the flexible printed circuit films*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed in FIG. 8 and column 2, paragraph 8 of Kawasaki.

First it is respectfully noted that claims 3-6 and 8 depend from independent claim 1, which is submitted as being allowable for defining over Nagata as discussed above. Second, it is respectfully submitted that use of *a plurality of straight connecting lines interconnecting chip drivers wherein the test pad is closer to an edge of the liquid crystal panel than to the connecting lines and a plurality of flexible printed circuit films attached to the liquid crystal panel, wherein the external devices are the flexible printed circuit films* allegedly taught in Kawasaki, or any other disclosure of Kawasaki, does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Nagata.

In addition, FIG. 8 of Kawasaki relied upon by the Examiner, the pads are located between the driver ICs (3), thus Kawasaki has the problem of interference between the signal lines and the inspection line and pads. However, the present application has the purpose of not interfering between the signal lines and the inspection line and pads. Kawasaki does not teach or suggest the test pad is disposed directly between the driver and the one edge of the TFT array panel, as in amended independent claim 1, from which claims 3-6 and 8 depend.

Moreover, regarding the rejection of claim 8, the Examiner states that “the test pad is closer to an edge of the liquid crystal panel than to the connecting lines” on page 3 of the Detailed Action is disclosed in Kawasaki. However, referring to Fig. 8 of Kawasaki, the comments of the Examiner are not correct, as the pads are located between the driver ICs (3), as discussed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 3-6 and 8 under § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/

James J. Merrick
Registration No. 43,801
Confirmation No. 7173
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Facsimile: (860) 286-0115

Date: October 4, 2007